CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1952

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 11 a. m., pursuant to call, in room F–39, the Capitol, Hon. Kenneth McKellar (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McKellar, McClellan, Robertson, Cordon, Ecton, Stennis, and Cain.

Present also: Senator Long.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. P. A. FERINGA, PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION; ACCOMPANIED BY H. V. DARLING, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS; AND MR. ALDRIDGE, MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

CLASSIFICATION SCHEDULES

Amounts available for obligation

	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate
Appropriation or estimate	$61,400,400	$60,500,000	$60,020,000
Proposed supplemental due to pay increases		20,000	
Prior-year balance available	650,105	503,173	
Reimbursements from non-Federal sources	564,743	600,000	600,000
Reimbursements from other accounts	373,828	900,000	600,000
Total available for obligation	62,989,076	62,523,173	61,220,000
Balance available in subsequent year	−503,173		
Obligations incurred	62,485,903	62,523,173	61,220,000

NOTE.—Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are received from private individuals, commercial concerns, nonappropriated funds, and States and municipalities (33 U. S. C. 558, 559, 571, 701, and 701k).

Obligations by activities

Description	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate
Direct Obligations			
MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY			
1. Construction (lower Mississippi River and tributaries):			
(a) Main-stem work	$30,116,140	$30,690,000	$30,800,000
(b) Off-main-stem work	18,583,413	15,346,350	14,200,000
CURRENT EXPENSES			
1. Maintenance (lower Mississippi River and tributaries):			
(a) Main-stem work	10,904,850	13,472,329	13,175,000
(b) Off-main-stem work	1,702,483	1,335,494	1,652,000
2. Administration (salaries, Office, Chief of Engineers, allotment roll)	150,446	179,000	193,000
Total direct obligations	61,547,332	61,023,173	60,020,000
Obligations Payable Out of Reimbursements From Other Accounts			
MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY			
1. Construction (lower Mississippi River and tributaries):			
(a) Main-stem work:			
1. Treasury Department, United States Coast Guard	188,053	305,500	288,000
2. Navy Department	2,912	3,800	4,100
3. Department of Army (military functions)	36,637	94,200	74,000
4. United States Air Force	1,910	5,800	6,500
5. Other Federal agencies	4,027	4,700	5,000
6. Non-Federal agencies	169,634	250,000	180,000
(b) Off-main-stem work (non-Federal agencies)	28,237	45,000	30,000
CURRENT EXPENSES			
1. Maintenance (lower Mississippi River and tributaries):			
(a) Main-stem work:			
1. Treasury Department, United States Coast Guard	56,172	82,500	88,000
2. Navy Department	5,408	7,400	8,000
3. Department of Army (military functions)	76,091	140,400	120,000
4. United States Air Force	1,918	5,700	6,400
5. Non-Federal agencies	366,788	554,900	389,900
(b) Off-main-stem work (non-Federal agencies)	84	100	100
2. Administration (salaries, Office, Chief of Engineers, allotment roll) (other Federal agencies)	700		
Total obligations payable out of reimbursements from other accounts	938,571	1,500,000	1,200,000
Obligations incurred	62,485,903	62,523,173	61,220,000

Obligations by objects

Object classification	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate
Summary of Personal Services			
Total number of permanent positions	3,937	3,897	3,814
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	880	904	884
Average number of all employees	4,631	4,616	4,517
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary	$3,828	$4,263	$4,254
Average grade	GS-5.7	GS-5.7	GS-5.7
Crafts, protective, and custodial grades:			
Average salary	$2,835	$3,166	$3,175
Average grade	CPC-4.3	CPC-4.4	CPC-4.4
Grades established by act of May 15, 1928 (33 U. S. C. 702h): Average salary	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500
Ungraded positions: Average salary	3,026	3,060	3,075
Personal service obligations:			
Pay and allowances to commissioned officers	$98,488	$99,000	$99,000
Permanent positions	13,053,554	13,835,969	13,707,961
Part-time and temporary positions	2,151,922	2,251,000	2,236,000
Regular pay in excess of 52-week base		53,131	52,639
Payment above basic rates	2,040,824	2,082,400	2,081,400
Total personal service obligations	17,344,788	18,321,500	18,177,000
Direct Obligations			
Personal services:			
Civilian	17,050,171	17,993,500	17,841,000
Pay and allowances to commissioned officers	98,488	99,000	99,000
Travel	601,479	590,000	595,000
Transportation of things	225,967	221,500	225,000
Communication services	118,648	116,300	117,000
Rents and utility services	148,891	145,900	148,000
Printing and reproduction	4,043	3,900	4,000
Other contractual services	1,347,554	1,320,600	1,345,000
Services performed by other agencies	88,645	86,900	88,000
Supplies and materials	11,636,378	11,403,600	11,630,000
Equipment	1,638,511	1,605,700	1,635,000
Lands and structures	29,040,390	27,862,273	26,724,000
Refunds, awards, and indemnities	3,550	3,500	3,500
Taxes and assessments	10,205	20,500	20,500
Subtotal	62,012,920	61,473,173	60,475,000
Deduct charges for quarters and subsistence	465,588	450,000	455,000
Total direct obligations	61,547,332	61,023,173	60,020,000
Obligations Payable Out of Reimbursements From Other Accounts			
Personal services, civilian	196,129	229,000	237,000
Travel	23,408	30,700	31,000
Transportation of things	4,614	5,600	5,700
Communication services	435	500	500
Rents and utility services	74,647	109,000	112,000
Printing and reproduction	1,619	1,800	2,000
Other contractual services	87,373	117,900	121,000
Supplies and materials	117,716	147,600	152,000
Equipment	370,484	779,990	459,690
Lands and structures	62,048	77,800	79,000
Taxes and assessments	98	110	110
Total obligations payable out of reimbursements from other accounts	938,571	1,500,000	1,200,000
Obligations incurred	62,485,903	62,523,173	61,220,000

Chairman McKellar. The committee will come to order.

Go ahead, General Feringa.

General Feringa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to open my remarks by saying how very pleased I am to appear before you, sir, and of course my own Senator from Mississippi, Senator Stennis. I come from your general jurisdiction. It gives me pleasure to visit Tennessee every so often; and, of course, I do in connection with my work. My own Senator is here, and I want to say "Hello" to him.

Chairman McKellar. He is one of the best.

General Feringa. I am Gen. P. A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission. I am accompanied by Mr. Darling, from the Office of Chief of Engineers, and Mr. Aldridge, from Vicksburg, Miss.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PLAN

We made a rather complete record last year, sir; so, if I may, I will make my present testimony short. I would like to emphasize, however, for the record, because you gentlemen know it, that the Mississippi River and tributary project is one project. It cannot be separated into its several items. All those items are interrelated. They are interdependent. They are dovetailed. The whole thing stands or falls as a group of dominoes. Any time you stop one part of our work you stop all of it. Any time you knock down one part you knock down all of it.

Chairman McKellar. You do not have a difference of opinion with the chairman of the committee on that. I feel the same way about it as you do.

General Feringa. Thank you, sir.

Our project authority dates back to May 15, 1928; and, although it has been added to, developed, and amended by additional legislation, the fact remains that the basic plan, a plan on a basin-wide conception, is fundamentally the same.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Our work is prosecuted by the Mississippi River Commission under the Chief of Engineers. The Mississippi River Commission was started in 1879, and I pay tribute to the foresight of the Congress back in 1879 in seeing the need for such a Commission.

The Commission consists of three members of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. It consists also of two civilian engineers who may not be military men. It also consists of one member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and one businessman. I have often thought that there is a cross section of what has made the United States. If you could add thereto a farmer, the clergy, and the legal and medical professions, you would have everything, but I am satisfied the way it is.

LOCAL COOPERATION

We have three districts. We have the Memphis district, the Vicksburg district, and the New Orleans district. Our work is cooperative. It is not only the Corps of Engineers but it is the Corps of Engineers and the levee boards. The ownership of the levees lies with and stays with the levee boards. The levees are owned by the local people. They are not owned by the Corps of Engineers or the United States.

The local people, through the levee boards, must furnish the money for lands and rights-of-way, and they must maintain all their projects after completion.

AUTHORIZED COST

The Federal authorized cost of our work is $1,292,748,500. That is the total authorized cost. We may not go above that unless future legislation should be enacted.

There has been appropriated to date $769,466,223, and that brings our project to 60-percent completion.

LOCAL COOPERATION

The local interests since the inception of their work have expended $340,900,000 and they started their work about 1717. I myself am proud of the fact that it is a cooperative project. I think that is the way it should be. The people living behind the levees own the levees, and they have to maintain them.

Senator LONG. A dollar could purchase a lot more at the time they began their work than it would purchase today.

General FERINGA. That is a very pertinent observation, Senator Long.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The Mississippi River Basin covers 1,250,000 square miles. It covers 41 percent of the United States plus a part of Canada. Its extent is outlined in black on this map. As you see, the Mississippi River Basin is nearly one-half the entire United States.

It has the major tributaries like the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Wabash, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the St. Francis, the west Tennessee tributaries—that is, the Obion; the Forked Deer, and the Wolf Rivers—and the Yazoo, the White, the Arkansas, the Red, the Black, and the Ouachita. All those streams are tributary to our own project for the lower Mississippi.

In effect, our part of the work is a funnel through which the water that falls on 41 percent of the United States must be contained.

RIVER NOT FILLING UP

Generally speaking, the average width of the river is 1 mile, but the average width between levees is 5 miles. I think that is an important observation, because you hear from time to time, even from people that you think should be informed, that our river is filling up. That is not so, sir. Our river is what we call, in engineering terminology, "poised." It is not deepening. It is not filling up. There may be a sand bar here today and next year it is gone; but, generally speaking, the river stays deep. One reason is because we do not levee the river itself, but rather its partial flood plain.

We levee the partial flood plain. I want to repeat that, the average width between levees is 5 miles, so that the water has planty of place to fill its channel, go over the banks, and act like it always has in nature, except that the flood plain is protected on the other side of that 5-mile average width by levees. For instance, to cite facts that the

river is not filling up, at New Orleans at mean low water the river is as much as 222 feet deep.

At Vicksburg, the bottom of the river at places is considerably below sea level, and Vicksburg is about 500 miles up the river; so, I make the statement without equivocation that the Mississippi River is not filling up.

There are 20,000,000 acres in our alluvial valley. Of that, 13,800,000 acres enjoy full protection and 4,000,000 acres partial protection.

MEANS OF FLOOD PROTECTION

We need all means for flood control. I am not going to talk about it long, but a project of this gigantic scope, where we have to take care of a flood of 3 million cubic feet per second, needs every means of logical flood protection.

We need reservoirs. We need levees.

Mr. Aldridge, you might show that picture of Cairo briefly. By levees, I mean levees and flood walls.

Here is a photograph showing the city of Cairo. I am pointing at the city. It is a prosperous city. It is protected. There is [pointing] the Mississippi and there is the Ohio. It is protected on the Mississippi side by a levee and on the Ohio side by a flood wall.

Right now, the river at Cairo is cresting. It is getting the effect of that flood on the Missouri and of the flood in the upper Mississippi.

Senator ROBERTSON. Did I understand you to say that there are 40,000,000 acres that need flood protection?

General FERINGA. No, sir. In the entire alluvial valley, there are 20,000,000 million acres. Of that, 13,800,000 acres have full protection and 4,000,000 have partial protection.

Senator ROBERTSON. That 4 million is about 10 times the entire State of Virginia. We have about 40,000 square miles in Virginia.

How many times is that bigger than Virginia?

General FERINGA. I do not know, in square miles, how big the State of Virginia is, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. We have about 40,000 square miles. What is this area in square miles?

General FERINGA. I do not have that figure in mind, but I can put it in the record, Senator. I do not know.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It will be put in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

The alluvial valley is 30,000 square miles in area.

COMPLETE FLOOD PROTECTION

General FERINGA. The total acreage in the alluvial valley is 20 million acres. Of that, 13,800,000 get full protection and 4 million get partial protection. The other acres would be backwater area and unprotected acreage.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, we need every type of flood protection. We need reservoirs to hold back the floodwaters up in the tributaries.

We need levees to levee the flood plains so that we can let out the floodwaters without harming the people.

We need cut-offs to speed the flow of the river to the sea, to speed up the velocity, and to shorten the course of the river. We need revetments to keep the river in place and we need floodways.

Chairman McKellar. General, can you answer this question? Has it been a success up to date?

General Feringa. It has been a complete success, limited only by the fact that it is not yet complete, sir. The project is not complete. However, since 1927, we have had no major flood hazard except that we had a levee break above Baton Rouge since I have been here. The project is a complete success.

Senator Long. You did manage to seal off that one break in the levee?

General Feringa. Yes, sir. We sealed it off in 72 hours. Those were very hard hours. I hope I never live through them that long again, but any time you meet the hazard successfully; finally you look back at it with some degree of pleasure. It was a success.

Briefly, sir, we are getting along. The project is a success because so much progress has been made.

It is a project for which you can check off many elements as complete.

STATUS OF WORK

For instance, we have five reservoirs within the alluvial valley, and of those five, four are complete, Wappalello, Arkabulta, Sardis, and Enid. The Grenada Reservoir is incomplete and that will be finished a year from next fall. You can see them here on this map [indicating].

Wappapello up in Missouri is complete. Arkabulta is complete. Sardis is complete. Enid is being finished now.

We need no more funds for Enid. Grenada will be complete a year from next fall.

On the main stem, we have 1,250 miles of levees complete of a total of 1,599 miles contemplated. That is on the main stem. The total of our levees on the main stem and the tributaries including the Atchafalaya, call for 3,554 miles of levees, of which 2,098 miles are complete. That 3,554 miles of levees is equivalent of the distance from Washington to London. That gives you an idea of how many miles of levees we have.

As to our revetments, 246.5 miles are complete out of 450.5 contemplated. The cut-offs are all complete. There are 16 of them.

FLOODWAYS

The floodways are all complete except the Atchafalaya, including the Morganza, and that is under way.

The subject of floodways brings me to the project flood. That is estimated at 3 million cubic feet per second. As a comparison the Missouri River flood that has just been encountered had about 400,000 cubic feet. I think that figure is correct in round numbers.

That horrible Kansas River flood we had last year was about 500,000 feet out of the Kansas River, so when I talk about our project of 3 million cubic feet that gives you an idea of how tremendously vast our project is.

Senator Stennis. At what point is that 3 million?

General FERINGA. That is below Vicksburg, sir. That is at the Red, where Mr. Aldridge is pointing, at Angola. It is a combination of Red River water and the Mississippi water.

In 1927, we had 2,615,000 cubic feet. That is pretty close. In 1950, we had 2,060,000 cubic feet per second. The 3 million which was set up as the design flood is not based on the maximum that all the tributaries could supply, but on a logical amount, because you cannot expect logically that the Ohio would be in major flood at the same time that the other tributaries are supplying their maximum.

Senator STENNIS. If I might interpose a question, in the 1950 flood when you had over 2 million cubic feet per second, you had no appreciable damage at that time?

General FERINGA. We had no appreciable damage except in the Red River backwater area.

Senator Long will know very much about that.

That item is incomplete. The only way that they could stay alive was to get on top of the levees. All the stock, the pigs, the deer, everything, was on the levee. However, we had no appreciable damage outside of that.

Chairman MCKELLAR. How long will it take you to finish that?

General FERINGA. That will be finished, including the funds in this bill in fiscal year 1954, sir. That will be finished with the 1954 appropriation.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The appropriation recommended by the budget?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. It means this appropriation before you and one more appropriation after that.

Senator STENNIS. I would like to ask one question on that same point.

1927 FLOOD

You had no appreciable damage in 1950 with your 2 million plus except in the area you mentioned, whereas, in 1927, before these dams were put in, you had this 2,615,000 cubic feet per second.

Will you give us some idea of what your damage was then?

General FERINGA. It would be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Senator STENNIS. Was it not estimated at $2 billion?

General FERINGA. I do not have the figures, but it would mean that the whole alluvial valley would be under water.

Senator STENNIS. It was in 1927, was it not?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

If I may go to the map, here is Greenville that I am pointing to. In 1927, the levee broke right above Greenville. This is the alluvial stream, the Mississippi River. The banks are higher than the surrounding country. Any time the Mississippi goes over its banks, it then inundates all this alluvial area. The result of that flood above Greenville in 1927 was that all the people not only lost their property and hurt their farming territory, but all their ditches, their drainage, and so forth were clogged.

Any time you have a flood in an alluvial valley, it means the same thing up in your area, Senator McClellan.

If you have a break anywhere along the St. Francis Basin, that water cannot get back in the Mississippi above Helena [indicating].

ST. FRANCIS PROJECT, LOUISIANA

Senator McCLELLAN. As to the point you are speaking about, that place up in Missouri where, if it breaks, it floods that same area, you have an acute problem there without any breaks already taking care of the St. Francis.

Have you anything in this bill for that project?

Has it been authorized?

General FERINGA. It has been authorized but there is only $500,000 set up for that St. Francis and the work should go along much faster.

Senator McCLELLAN. I do not want to interrupt your thought now, but when you conclude what you have in mind, I certainly want you to discuss that problem.

General FERINGA. I will be glad to, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. General, while you are still being interrupted, I think most of us are going to have to be on the floor this afternoon and I notice that the House took 1,563 pages of testimony. You presented to us this morning an "Analysis of Plans and Specifications and Justifications" of 232 pages.

Is this the same testimony that was presented to the House committee and printed in these hearings we have?

General FERINGA. My testimony is a very boiled-down version. I merely wanted to bring out in 15 minutes, I hope, the background for this project. Undoubtedly there will be some repetition, but it would be very slight.

Senator ROBERTSON. But you do not plan to put all this statement in our record that has already been printed on the House side?

General FERINGA. No, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. Was this offered for our record?

It is before me here. I just wondered what you were going to do.

General FERINGA. I do not know what you have there.

Senator ROBERTSON. It is 232 pages. It is called Corps of Engineers.

Chairman McKELLAR. That covers all of the whole engineer problem, as I understand it.

General FERINGA. That must be so, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. Was this testimony given to the House and printed?

Chairman McKELLAR. I am informed that it has not been printed.

Senator ROBERTSON. Are these 232 pages new and materially different from that that was presented to the House?

General FERINGA. I do not know, sir, because I did not give that testimony.

I think it is new testimony prepared by the Chief of Engineers in appealing for those items which were stricken out by the House.

Senator ROBERTSON. All that I have before me, these 232 pages, are appeals for various items that were stricken out in the House, and it is new testimony?

Chairman McKELLAR. It is for the whole body of engineers.

Senator ROBERTSON. The reason I ask, Mr. Chairman, is I noticed in the paper that you had indicated to some witness that our committee was so limited in time that you could not possibly hear everybody who did not get what they wanted in the House or did not get some project included in the House and wanted to come before us,

and that you would like the witnesses to be very brief on new projects that were not presented in the House. Those that did fully present their testimony in the House were to merely summarize what they presented or call to our attention something new that the House had not seen.

Chairman McKellar. That is not exactly right, but it is in substance.

What we suggested was this: Inasmuch as we have gone over these hearings a number of times, we have asked the officials of the Corps of Engineers to be as brief as possible and the officials of the various places that are interested in this bill.

For instance, my home city of Memphis is interested in one of the projects—you remember we had quite a number of witnesses here, Senator—and we have Mr. Fowler with us this morning who is going to submit that case.

We wanted to shorten these as much as possible. That is all.

We are going to give everybody a chance. Any Senator will have a right to come before this committee. There will be no trouble about that.

Senator Robertson. I think it would be very fine to give everybody a chance.

The House gave them a chance from the 16th of January until the middle of March. If we give everybody a chance, it will be past the 4th of July before we finish hearing them all.

Chairman McKellar. I think we can get through before that time.

General Feringa. I will keep mine short, sir.

This brings me to the fact that to take care of 3 million cubic feet per second we have to take one-half of it down the Mississippi River and the other half down the floodways. I could explain that in detail, but you have had that before and I just wanted to bring it out to you very briefly.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

I would like to emphasize that this project is both flood control and navigation. Without showing you the many pictures which we have here, I would like to leave them for a short while with the committee.

Here is a chart showing how water-borne traffic on the Mississippi River has mounted steadily from year to year with the exception of the year right after the war when there was a regrouping of transportation media and then afterward it jumped up strongly.

You will see that we have 70 million tons per year on the Mississippi River from Minneapolis to the Gulf. I bring this out because we are in a period of stress and it is important, to my mind, that we consider what the Mississippi carries, what type of traffic as well as the tonnage.

Chairman McKellar. General, I want you to bring that out and at the same time show the increase.

For instance, it is very cheap traffic. It is largely very heavy traffic like oil, steel, wood, and things of that sort that are carried by barges up this river and that is why the Corps of Engineers recommended what they have recommended concerning this stream.

General Feringa. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

It is bulk traffic that can move more cheaply by water than any other means and that is true including pipelines when you consider the collection and distribution cost.

Senator McCLELLAN. Does any bauxite move up?

General FERINGA. Some into New Orleans and Baton Rouge, but the Ouachita River navigation project is not complete.

Senator McCLELLAN. When that Ouachita River navigation is complete, considerable bauxite will move up that river; will it not?

General FERINGA. I should think it would.

Senator McCLELLAN. We stress the tonnage of 70 million tons moving, but that is just a part of the benefits from navigation. It affects the whole economic structure of that section with respect to transportation rates.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. It has its impact on transportation rates in that whole area.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Great benefits are derived in savings of transportation costs that are not directly reflected in this project itself.

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. And the freight and cargo that moves on the river.

General FERINGA. When you think that that traffic may be picked up at Corpus Christi, Tex., and go up to Pittsburgh, the Great Lakes, or up to St. Paul, it gives you an idea of the tremendous area involved.

TYPE OF TRAFFIC

I broke down percentagewise how that tonnage is distributed:

Petroleum, 63 percent; ores, including bauxite, 7 percent; iron and steel products, 5 percent; grain, which is increasing, 4 percent; sugar and molasses, 3 percent; sulfur, 3 percent; chemicals, 3 percent; coal and coke, 2 percent: miscellaneous food products, 2 percent; forestry products, pulpwood, and that kind of product, 2 percent; and miscellaneous, 6 percent.

Senator McCLELLAN. Those are the percentages of the tonnage?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir, of the tonnage.

That is 70 million tons broken down percentagewise.

Senator McCLELLAN. Have you any estimate of the value of that?

General FERINGA. I do not have that, sir.

Here is a photograph taken right outside of Memphis showing a special barge built for automobiles. Those automobiles probably came from Evanston, Ind.

They are driven right off this special barge and then they go to the distributors.

Senator CORDON. How many cars are on that barge?

General FERINGA. I do not know, sir.

Senator CORDON. I think that is the most important piece of information we could get.

General FERINGA. I will count them, sir, and put them in the record. Meanwhile, you might want to look at them.

(The information referred to follows:)

The barge shown on that picture is loaded with 600 automobiles and trucks, other types of car barges carry from 300 to 400 automobiles.

General FERINGA. Here is another picture also of Memphis.

Here is a tow going upstream. It carries oil, sulfur, and scrap iron. You will notice the extent of that tow, sir.

Here is a picture showing two tows, an oil tow going upstream and a miscellaneous tow going downstream. That miscellaneous tow carries steel products undoubtedly from around Pittsburgh.

Here is another picture showing an upstream tow. It carries scrap iron, sulfur, pipe, and these covered barges usually carry grain, going downstream and items like sugar going upstream.

Here is a picture showing an unusual tow. It is a Victory ship cut down. I think it was cut down in Baltimore and brought around the Gulf. It goes up the Mississippi to the Great Lakes ores trade.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Will the percentage of steel be increased or decreased if the dams on the Cumberland River are built?

General FERINGA. I think it would be increased, sir.

NO NEW STARTS POLICY

I have one other major point I would like to make: That the appropriation bill before you includes no new starts. The Budget Bureau put that prohibition on us and there are no new starts included.

NO CARRY-OVER FUNDS

Finally, I would like to make of record the status of our unobligated balance. We use every cent that the Congress appropriates to us every year.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That includes the $60,500,000 that we appropriated last year?

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir. We ended up the 1950 fiscal year with a balance of $647,461. We ended up in 1951 with a balance of $501,417. This year we expect to scrape the barrel and our estimate for June 30, 1952, is $280,000.

As of the end of April, we had an unobligated balance of $7,740,507, and we have 2 months left to go.

HIGH WATER CONDITIONS

The high-water conditions that confront us in the face of what has happened on the Missouri, I think, are interesting. At Cairo, the high water right now is reaching its crest. That is the flood from the upper Mississippi and the Missouri. Our gage at Cairo today will stand at 44. We expect it to stand at 44 tomorrow also.

Senator CORDON. Is that 44 feet above low water mean?

General FERINGA. That is from the bottom of the gage and I think that is slightly below mean low water.

Senator CORDON. Have you any idea what the average would be there without floods and when it is running somewhere near what you might term "normal"?

General FERINGA. The 42 to 43 feet is bankfull, sir, and the flood wall at Cairo is built to 64.7. In other words, we have room for 20 more feet on top of what we have, which would have to come out of the Ohio, and I pray that that will not happen, sir.

At this time of the year you cannot logically expect it, although you can expect anything in the Mississippi River.

The Kentucky Dam, which is one of the TVA reservoirs, right at the mouth of the Tennessee and one that I always watch carefully because it has an effect from the Tenessee water just like our dams on the Cumberland have, has no water in the flood-control part of its pool. That is as it should be. The rule curve is higher now than it would be at the beginning of the year, so therefore we have storage at that location.

The quantity of water passing Vicksburg at this time is 1,150,000 cubic feet per second and again I would like you to compare that with the Kansas River flood of 500,000 cubic feet per second last year, or the Missouri flood of 400,000 cubic feet per second. The river is bankfull.

I would like to emphasize that 10 to 14 days of heavy concentrated rain in the Ohio Valley would give us a flood, but you cannot expect it at this time of the year.

IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT

I would like to emphasize that during World War II, the Congress singled out this project as important enough to go forward, and I think that can be seen when you think of the transportation and the essential elements of that transportation—oil, sulfur, bauxite, automobiles, trucks, grain, and you might well say our economy cannot function without that.

I feel that the Mississippi Valley tributary project is a development of a natural resource. It is of benefit to the entire United States in ever-increasing quantities. It makes the valley rich and it prevents a major catastrophe like the flood of 1927.

MEMPHIS HARBOR

The budget estimate is for $60,020,000—I think you all have these sheets before you—of which $15 million is for maintenance, leaving $45 million for construction. That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to Memphis Harbor; I am glad that Mr. Bill Fowler, city engineer from Memphis, is here. The only item that the House cut in our project is the item for the Mephis Harbor, and if I may, I would like to read from the House report, on page 10:

> The reduction is achieved—

that is, the $915,000 reduction—

> by denying the funds requested in the amount of $665,000 for the construction of a sanitary sewer for the Memphis Harbor project in the belief that this item is not properly a charge against the Federal Government and should be borne by the local interests.

The other part of the reduction was achieved by reducing our emergency funds by $250,000 from the total of $500,000 to $250,000, but I would like to address my remarks to the reduction of $665,000 which, in my opinion—and I speak in deference to the House—is needed and should be restored.

Senator ROBERTSON. Before you do that, is it a fact that the justification of the Army engineers to which I previously referred shows that they are not going to use that fund on the harbor?

Here is the way I read it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What are you reading from?

Senator ROBERTSON. I am reading from page 215 of the Corps of Engineers, April 22, 1952, "Rivers and harbors, examination, survey, planning, and other study programs," which the committee said is all new testimony that goes into our record.

I assume that was the official position of the Army engineers.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, go ahead.

CONSTRUCTION LOWER MISSISSIPPI TRIBUTARIES

Senator ROBERTSON. It reads this way:

Justification: (1) This amendment would restore $665,000, the amount deleted from the estimate by the House and would be applied by activities as follows:
Project: Construction Lower Mississippi tributaries.
(1) Main-stem work, $30,135,000; proposed amendment, $665,000; total request $30,800,000.
Off main-stem work, $14,200,000; proposed amendment, $14,200,000.

When they list that as main-stem work does that mean a sewer line for the harbor?

General FERINGA. No, sir; the main-stem work is work along the main stem of the Mississippi River rather than on the tributaries of the Mississippi River.

Senator ROBERTSON. I just wanted to know whether the Army engineers are asking for this restoration for main-stem work or whether they have asked for it for the same thing that you are now going to ask it for.

General FERINGA. They are asking for it for the sewer which is the part of the main-stem work, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. Then you and the Army engineers are in agreement and when they list this as main-stem work, it means for a sewer line?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir; and I am a member of the Army engineers.

Senator ROBERTSON. I wanted to understand whether you and the Army engineers were in agreement. And when we make this a part of our record, and assuming that we add the amount that you are requesting, this indicates how it is going to be spent, and it means that there will be an expenditure for the sewer line that the House turned down?

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir; and may I say, Senator, I think what you have been reading from is the reclama of the Chief of Engineers for restoration of the customary language that makes our funds available until expended. I, of course, am heartily in favor of this reclama since deletion of that language would greatly handicap orderly prosecution of our work.

Senator MCCLELLAN. The term "main stem" refers to what is on the Mississippi River proper whereas other work which might be on tributaries would be a part of the over-all program and project?

General FERINGA. That is correct, Senator McClellan.

Senator MCCLELLAN. That term is used to distinguish as between projects on the river proper and on the tributaries of the river?

General FERINGA. It is just like saying that it is in one State instead of in another. You say that it is on the main stem or off the main stem. It is merely a geographical identification.

MEMPHIS HARBOR SEWER PROJECT

I went into this question of the Memphis harbor, sir, after the House took this action. Again I speak in deference to the House. I was not in this country—I was overseas—at the time the Memphis Harbor Report was written. So I went back to the original source which originally developed the Memphis harbor report, and talked to the people who worked on the project prior to its going to Congress for authorization.

The authorization for Memphis harbor includes the Memphis harbor sewer.

The question, then, of course, was: Why should the United States build a sewer?

Now, this project consists of a dam at the head of Tennessee Chute in the Mississippi River through which low-water flow used to pass. We have completed the dam across the head of Tennessee Chute, making this a still-water lake very much like Lake Ferguson, Senator Stennis, at Greenville.

The question then was this: Inasmuch as this water would become still water and inasmuch as there was sewage being dumped into Tennessee Chute at the location where I am pointing to, how would it be possible to flush out that water?

It could be done by one of two ways.

One was that you could extend the sewer and dump the sewage into the Mississippi River or another, you could make a large opening, a culvert or a group of pipes right through the dam and from the river into the harbor. Those were the only two ways you could do it.

Then the question, of course, was: Which would be the cheapest and which would be the best. So I went back to the original figures. I would like to state them to you for the record because I think they are important.

The culvert would cost as follows: The coffer dam would cost $2 million. These are estimates made at the time the report was written and on 1946 figures.

The coffer dam would cost $2,136,960. The concrete in the culvert would cost $1,600,000. The reinforcing steel would cost $1,500,000. That would be a total of $5,236,000.

Senator ROBERTSON. To which you could now add about 50 percent?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. I see that you are acquainted with some recent construction costs.

We always add the cost of the engineering, the contractor's profit, and all that. We apply a 25-percent factor for engineering and contingencies which amount was $1,313,040. So the estimated cost for the culvert through the dam, the hole through the dam, would be $6,550,000.

That was too high. So then they figured out how much the sewer would cost. They figured that they needed a 60-inch sewer which is what we still feel is needed. There would need to be 27,000 feet of it at an estimated cost of $999,000.

Senator ROBERTSON. When was that?

General FERINGA. This same year, 1946. These were the original estimates which I am now giving you, Senator Robertson.

The gates and valves would cost $10,500. The manholes would cost $30,000. The outfall structure would cost $14,000. That would be

a total of $1,053,500, to which is added the same 25 percent for engineering and contingencies in the amount of $296,500, which comes to a grand total of $1,350,000.

That was, therefore, the big reason for choosing the sewer. That was not a betterment to the city of Memphis. Memphis got no benefits from it. It is just a question of being an integral part of the construction, that is, either a hole through he dam or a sewer.

Senator McClellan. In other words, if you constructed the project and did not take care of that situation, it would place a burden on the city that would have to be taken care of by reason of the improvement made for navigation?

General Feringa. Yes, sir. One thing or the other was needed, or else the project would not be feasible from an engineering standpoint.

Senator Robertson. General, what became of the sewer befor you put that dam in at the neck there?

Gneral Feringa. There was not any sewer there, sir. All along the Mississippi River and also in the Ohio River they dump their raw sewage into the river. The current of the river and the amount of water present is so fast and of such quantity that it sweeps everything along all of the way down to the Gulf of Mexico.

Senator Robertson. Now, take this area to the left which is part of the city of Memphis; before you dammed it up and made kind of a lake there, where did the sewer go?

SEWER PROBLEM

General Feringa. This is Memphis itself that I am pointing at.

Senator Robertson. Where did the sewer lines go?

General Feringa. This is Tennesseee Chute which is dammed off.

Now, the sewage that we are talking about was collected in the Nonconnah Creek sewer which comes in at about the point I am indicating. That was where part of the sewage of the city of Memphis was collected and dumped into the Tennessee Chute which was really part of the Mississippi River and which then flowed on into the open water.

Now, if I may go on for just a minute. In addition to the greater cost of bringing this sewer down here rather than building a hole through the dam, we had to look at it from the standpoint of engineering safety. As you gentlemen who live in the alluvial valley along the Mississippi River know, we never allow openings through the levees. We pump over the levees, but we never allow openings through the levees. The people who were considering this were afraid to put an opening through this dam because the ground might settle. They were afraid it would not be good from an engineering standpoint.

This is slack water. Of course, the river goes around this location, and so you are therefore bound to encounter siltation. Senator McKellar will probably recall that last summer you could see willows growing along in here.

Chairman McKellar. Indeed we did.

General Feringa. That would mean that you would have to constantly dredge that opening or flush that silt through the dam. That was the last thing we wanted to happen because we wanted to keep this channel open.

Senator ROBERTSON. The point that bothers me is this: You have said that before you put the dam across Tennessee Chute the city of Memphis fed their raw sewage into Tennessee Chute which is really a part of the Mississippi River, that the sewage then flowed around the little island and on down the stream, into the Mississippi River and finally into the Gulf of Mexico.

What did the Engineers think was going to become of that sewage when they put the dam across Tennessee Chute and cut off the current? What did they figure would become of the sewage when they built the dam and did not include a flushway in the dam which would carry enough current so as to move the sewage?

General FERINGA. That was the problem, sir, and we solved it by including an extension to the sewer. That is in the authorized project. The authorized project calls for the extension of the Nonconnah Creek sewer all the way to this point I am indicating, so that it would again be possible to dump the sewage into the Mississippi River.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, this is not an unexpected development. This is part of the original plan conceived before the project was authorized and started?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. Thank you, Senator McClellan.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It is in the law, and in addition to that there has already been an appropriation made for it?

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir.

COST OF MEMPHIS SEWER PROJECT

Chairman MCKELLAR. And a very small amount has been spent?

General FERINGA. A very small part of the money has been spent because I have held up the advertising.

Senator ROBERTSON. It was going to cost $1,304,000 in 1946. How are you going to build it with this $1,665,000?

General FERINGA. As I stated, those figures were the 1946 figures. Our figures now, sir, for the sewer are $1,433,000. Of that, last year there was allotted $318,000. For the fiscal year 1953 and in the budget, which amount the House took out, we had $665,000. I was planning in 1954 to ask you for the final figure of $450,000 for the construction of the sewer.

Now, Senator Robertson might well ask why it did not go up more. The answer is the same statement I made last year. When we go before this committee, we try to overestimate rather than underestimate, in order to be on the safe side.

Senator ECTON. What is the length of that extension, General?

General FERINGA. I will have that for you in just a minute, the length of sewer is 27,000 feet.

Senator ROBERTSON. Let me get this point clear in my mind. It was a part of the original project, and you have already spent how much on it?

General FERINGA. We have not yet spent it, sir. We have allotted for it the amount of $318,000.

Senator ROBERTSON. But the House cut off your unexpended funds?

General FERINGA. No, sir. The House cut out the additional amount in the budget of $665,000.

Senator ROBERTSON. I understood that the Army engineers were complaining that the House had prohibited them from spending in the fiscal year 1953 the unexpended funds that they had in fiscal 1952.

General FERINGA. Not so far as I know, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. Not in this instance?

General FERINGA. I have not read that statement. It may well be, sir. If the House action had not taken place, we would have advertised this work in March or April.

Senator ROBERTSON. You had how much of a carry-over?

General FERINGA. We have set it up at $318,000, and before we advertise for this work we would need the additional $665,000.

Senator ROBERTSON. What is the status of the $318,000?

General FERINGA. If that is not used for this sewer, it will be put into other work in the Mississippi River and tributaries project where the money is badly needed.

Senator ROBERTSON. And that is part of the current year's appropriation which expires on June 30?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

CONSTRUCTION START

Senator FERGUSON. And if you get the $665,000, you will start the project?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. That will be $983,000?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. Then how much money will it take to finish the project?

General FERINGA. It would take another $450,000 to finish the project. I figure that the contractor's earnings in 12 months will be close to $1 million. That is the reason we need the two allotments. When you start a project of this scope and stop, that is when it costs money. You have to have enough money for the contractor to see his way through and to keep on going.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, you cannot operate economically with only $318,000 available to start with until you know that you are going to get the balance of the money?

General FERINGA. That is right. It would just be foolishness to start otherwise.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, if this action of the House were to be sustained by the Senate and the Congress definitely decided that it was not going to pay for the project that it had authorized, then it would just be wasting the $318,000 if you were to start the project?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. We would put that $318,000 into levees where the money is needed—and we would do that fast, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. You established the fact that Congress authorized this dam on Tennessee Chute. I supose that is a flood-control dam there?

General FERINGA. No, sir. It is a navigation project for the harbor.

Senator ROBERTSON. And Congress authorized the extension of this sewer line which has not been built. How long has this sewage been dumped into the stagnant Tennessee Chute?

General FERINGA. It was not stagnant until we built the dam.

Senator ROBERTSON. And about how long has that been?

General FERINGA. About one year, and it is a very noisome situation as Mr. Fowler will tell you later.

Senator ROBERTSON. What I was leading up to is whether this is an acute problem or whether it could go over until the finances are in a little better shape. In other words, is the situation getting worse very rapidly?

General FERINGA. It is acute, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Was it contemplated that this project would be constructed simultaneously with the dam?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. From the beginning?

General FERINGA. Yes, from the beginning, all the way through. It is an integral part of the project. You cannot separate it.

Senator ROBERTSON. Was this situation developed before the House committee?

General FERINGA. Partly, sir, but not to this extent, because, of course, I did not know that the House committee was contemplating this action. They did ask me some questions about it, but at that time I had not studied the original figures.

Now, again, I speak in deference to the House committee. They are fine. They are splendid gentlemen.

Senator CORDON. Did they ask you about the carry-over, General; that is, the House folks?

General FERINGA. I do not recall, sir, but I believe they did. I cannot answer the question. I imagine they did because they went into everything very thoroughly, sir.

Senator CORDON. I am surprised that they would refuse to continue construction already begun and at the same time not make arrangements for a proper identification and use of funds already appropriated and expended or obligated.

General FERINGA. In justice, I must say that the work has not yet been started because I have held off the advertisement.

Senator CORDON. I was wondering why they would refuse a partial construction request and at the same time not rescind the initial appropriation which had not yet been used.

Senator ROBERTSON. I think they did, sir. I think I saw somewhere a complaint about the House cutting off the unexpended balances and not letting them carry the projects forward. That is not in there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. If it is in there, I did not see it.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Under what authority could you use that money on a levee, for instance, when it is appropriated for the sewer?

General FERINGA. Our funds are not appropriated for any single item. Our appropriation comes for the Mississippi River and tributaries project.

Senator MCCLELLAN. And you have allocated that out of the general appropriation?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Now, on the basis of what the House has appropriated this year, you would have no funds to allocate to this project?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Because the House specifically refused to include sufficient funds for the project?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. And also referred to it specifically, saying that funds should not be spent on it?

General FERINGA. Yes; that is right, sir.

It is my own viewpoint that, if the congressional committee says that no more funds are to be allotted for this project, we would be doing the wrong thing to put a small piece down there which might not be continued. It would be going contrary to congressional intent. In addition to that, you would increase the cost of the work by advertising it piecemeal. We need the money badly in many places, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, this is what we are establishing by this testimony: The House now takes the position that this part of the project should never have been authorized and that it was an obligation of the city and not an obligation of the Federal Government.

General FERINGA. That is my understanding, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is exactly right.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Yet all of the plans have been made and the authorization has been made and the initial funds have been made available to carry out the original obligation assumed by the Federal Government.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

May I say that I am grateful for all of these questions because at the time I appeared before the House committee, not knowing that they were thinking of reducing the appropriation for that element, I could not bring out all of this testimony. I speak in deference to the House committee. They did not know, for instance, the comparison of the cost of the culverts through the dam versus the cheaper sewer. They did not know because I did not know it was coming up, and therefore I could not stress the fact that the culverts through the dam would not work on account of the siltation. So I am glad for this opportunity.

I would like to bring out one other fact, and that is that this is not a betterment in any way for the city of Memphis. If it was, I could see why they should be charged therefor. There is some sewage that the city of Memphis is collecting, but they are bringing that to a point above the dam at their cost, and they are dumping that into the Mississippi River at this location [indicating]. The Memphis sewer that the House took out—and again I speak in deference to the House committee—did not apply to the local sewage problem for which the city of Memphis must and should be held responsible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to keep my testimony brief. I know that you are important individuals, the members of your distinguished committee, and I have tried to hold my presentation to the minimum. I am now available for any questions.

Senator CORDON. May I ask a few questions?

Chairman MCKELLAR. Go ahead, Senator.

Senator CORDON. I think we might supplement the record with one or two other items.

General FERINGA. May I interrupt a moment, Senator, to say that Mr. William Fowler, the city engineer from Memphis, is here, and undoubtedly he can substantiate what I have said.

Senator CORDON. I think these questions should be directed to the general.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We will ask the gentlemen of the committee to hear Mr. Fowler for a few moments a little later.

General FERINGA. I am at your service, Senator Cordon.

PARTICIPATION BY CITY OF MEMPHIS

Senator CORDON. The dam which you mentioned and which cuts off the chute into which the sewage is now dumped and which forms slack water was a part of the over-all project of Memphis Harbor, was it not?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. The sanitation addition was a part of the original project when the document was presented to the Congress?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. And authorized as such?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. Do you recall whether when the over-all project was considered and finally approved by the Corps of Engineers and sent to the Congress there was any requirement for any participation by the city of Memphis?

General FERINGA. Do you mean for the sewer?

Senator CORDON. For anything.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. They were required to make the lands and the rights-of-way available and to develop the entire harbor project. That development cost in the neighborhood—I am talking from memory, but I will correct the figures for the record—about $27 million. Those facilities must be made available to all persons on equal terms.

Senator CORDON. So there was required heavy participation by the city of Memphis, local participation, at the time the project was submitted to the Congress?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. While this particular item was not a part of local participation, there was local participation up through better than $20 million?

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir; the cost of developing the local interest part is $28,654,000.

Senator CORDON. That is all.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other questions?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, after the regular members of the subcommittee have completed their questions, I have two or three questions I would like to ask.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Maybe they would fit into the discussion at this point.

Senator STENNIS. They are on a separate small project.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER PROJECT, ARKANSAS

Senator MCCLELLAN. General Feringa, I would like to get into the record at this point briefly, some testimony regarding the Arkansas-St. Francis situation.

You say you have about $500,000 in this budget for that project?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. $500,000 in this budget.

Senator MCCLELLAN. What can you do with that small amount?

General FERINGA. May I turn to my map for a moment, sir?

Senator MCCLELLAN. What amount was made available last year?

General FERINGA. $500,000 was made available last year.

Senator McCLELLAN. I wish you would give us a little information about how that $500,000 is being expended and what you can do with this $500,000.

General FERINGA. This entire St. Francis River project stems from the basic operation of the alluvial Mississippi. As I said before, the Mississippi River goes through its valley, which is a geologic trench which has been filled up with very rich soil. As these floods for many, many years have passed—and incidentally the biggest flood that was ever heard of was in 1844—the river has built up its banks so that right along the river itself is the highest part of that area. West and east of the river back to the hill line it is lower than at the bank of the river.

Therefore, when the river flows over its banks or over its levees, or through its levees, all of this territory is flooded.

Now, the St. Francis Basin starts way up at Cape Girardeau. You have a levee up there. Then the St. Francis River flows all the way down to a point well below Memphis and right above Helena. This river area is a prosperous area.

Senator McCLELLAN. I have just one other question. De we not have an over-all plan for the St. Francis?

General FERINGA. We have an over-all plan.

Senator McCLELLAN. And is it not part now of the over-all plan for the Mississippi River?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir; it is part of that.

Senator McCLELLAN. And it is integrated into it; is it not?

General FERINGA. Yes; it is. It is an off-river project instead of an on-river project, which is nothing more than a geographical delineation.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is, it is off the main stem?

General FERINGA. It is off the main stem instead of being on the main stem.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

The entire project is authorized to cost $44,826,000. That is the amount of the authorization. It is one of the projects that was authorized only partially. Of that amount, there has been allocated to date $16,494,000. There is an allocation in the bill before you which went through the House of $500,000.

The project covers southeastern Missouri and northeastern Arkansas.

WAPPAPELLO RESERVOIR, ARK.

Now, the Wappapello Reservoir is completed and is functioning satisfactorily. It is to discharge its flood flows between levees which would be set back from the river. Those levees are not yet complete. There is a total of 227 miles of levees.

Now, I will not go into this whole project because it would take a great deal of time. But I would like to say that with the 1953 funds we plan on building 10 miles of levees which is a continuation of what you might call the headwater project.

The total area to be protected as a result of this entire project is 1,960,000 acres—and they are beautiful acres, as you know. All of those alluvial acres are magnificent. There is that plus railroads, small towns, and all that. This will bring the project to about 38 percent completion.

Now, what is happening is this: As these people up in Missouri—and properly so—farm their lands and improve their drainage, the people in northern Arkansas farm their land and get their drainage, and all of that water runs out more and more rapidly until it comes down here and the river is unable to handle it.

CHANNELIZATION PROJECT

Senator McCLELLAN. What is the plan in the project to take care of the accelerated flow and the higher level of water that is being developed down there?

General FERINGA. The plan is to make an adequate mouth for the St. Francis. The St. Francis now wanders around in swamps and trees. The plan is to protect this backwater area by levees, to make an adequate channel by cut-offs, and to improve the mouth of the St. Francis River so that it can discharge its flood flow into the Mississippi River.

Senator McCLELLAN. What is that project to cost, that channel project down there, if you recall the amount?

General FERINGA. The initial channel could be provided and levees alongside, in round numbers, for $5 million. You could start the project for $1,500,000.

Senator McCLELLAN. And that is what you recommend in order to get started this year?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. I wish you would describe and give us your views regarding the acuteness of this situation of this backwater area where the mouth of the river does not provide flow sufficient to get that water off.

General FERINGA. It is very much like the situation below the Arkansas River where there is a large group of small farms. The people have been trying to farm the land, and every year they are forced out because they plant their crops and lose them or else they cannot get the water off the ground and they cannot plant their crops.

Senator McCLELLAN. Would you call this an acute situation?

General FERINGA. It is extremely acute, sir. The small landowners are losing their holdings. The small landowners are being forced off their farms. I suppose that what they are doing is going to the cities and trying to make a go of it there. As a result of this situation, instead of being a prosperous farming section, this area could become a swamp.

Senator McCLELLAN. Would you say that this project is vital to the development of the area?

General FERINGA. It is vital, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. May I ask you one other question? You spoke of drainage and drainage ditches.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Are those not investments of the local landowners?

General FERINGA. The minor drainage ditches which drain the farms and the plantations are the investments of the local owners. But in order for them to get rid of their contributions of excess water the Federal Government is opening up the whole St. Francis River in order to take care of that water.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is what the project is for. Have they not spent millions and millions of dollars there developing drainage systems, and are not those investments going to be destroyed unless this work is done?

General FERINGA. That is absolutely correct, sir. I would say that millions of dollars have been spent, as you say.

Senator McCLELLAN. I know that it runs into the millions. They have been taxed for those projects, and they have their money now in bond issues for their local contributions to their projects.

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. And they are paying interest on that.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. That was done with the idea that the Government was going to carry on its part?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

HOUSE CUT

Chairman McKELLAR. How much did the House reduce this item?

General FERINGA. The Budget cut it to $500,000, sir.

Chairman McKELLAR. The Budget cut it?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. The House took it the way it was. To answer your question completely I felt that this project was so important that when I made up the estimate as shown on the table prepared at the request of the committee, I asked the Bureau of the Budget for $3,409,000, of which $2 million, as I recall, would go to the development of the lower St. Francis River. I cannot see the idea, as an engineer, of keeping on working on the upper part of the river and meanwhile making it worse for the people downstream.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is what has actually happened; is it not?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. If your plans for this project could be financed, you would cut these channels there so as to take care of the surface water?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. In other words, the dikes that you have been building along the upper reaches of the river are causing more water to be poured into the lower reaches of the river?

General FERINGA. That is true. Then you have the smaller farmers getting the water on their lands.

To go back to the original picture, this water cannot drain into the Mississippi, because you have the alluvial high banks plus the levees. The water up here at Cape Girardeau has to come all the way down here, a distance of about 150 to 200 miles. Then every time a man opens up a small ditch on his farm along here, it makes the condition for the people down here worse.

I would say without question that this is a vital project.

Senator McCLELLAN. It is vital?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. I hope you will pardon me for talking with so much heat, but I have seen that country and I know the situation.

Senator McCLELLAN. I know that that is what is reported to me. I am not an engineer, but these people just cry that they are being

destroyed. Their investments are being lost. They cannot farm the land. They have seen that situation aggravated by other projects that are being completed. The flow of water has increased, and the level of the water is still rising each year.

General FERINGA. When we have a major flood, such as we have had on the Missouri, it means also that we are having high water on the Arkansas, the Red River, and the St. Francis, usually, because when you have much rain or snow in one part of the country it does not stop at one basin. The St. Francis has had high water, not what you would call a serious flood, but what I would call high water.

Mr. Darling reminds me that that area has been classified a disaster area.

Senator MCCLELLAN. A disaster area because of these conditions, you mean?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. And we have been distributing disaster relief in that area?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

ORIGINAL BUDGET ESTIMATE

Senator MCCLELLAN. Now, there is just one other thing to complete the record. As I understand it, you have asked the Budget Bureau for $3,409,000?

General FERINGA. That is right, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. And they allowed only $500,000?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCLELLAN. You say that if you had $1,500,000 now you could start the project?

General FERINGA. If we had $1,500,000 on top of the $500,000 which has been allowed, we could start the channel work. But I would not start it with less than that amount because then you would have a costly project.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, that is the minimum amount that you can economically use in 1 year?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

YAZOO RIVER PROJECT, MISSISSIPPI

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief questions.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Go ahead, Senator.

Senator STENNIS. I want to call your attention, General, to the Yazoo River project. The Congress appropriated for that project, in the fiscal year 1951, but the funds were eliminated under the President's cut-back order due to the start of the Korean war.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. I wish you would point out—I know that that is one of your troublesome spots—I wish you would cover that as briefly as you can. Will you cover the major points for the benefit of the committee?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. If I may again return to one of my maps, Yazoo City is a fine, prosperous small city on the banks of the Yazoo River. It is a community that partially gets under water,

that gets wet every year. Yazoo City is the main town and Jonestown is right across the river.

The Yazoo River flows as the blue line on the map depicts across this green area and crosses the channel down this way. There is a small community called Jonestown across the river.

That part of Yazoo City, which is a low-lying area, is occupied not by what you would call rich houses but still substantial houses and industry. They have a fine colored school there.

At the spot where I am pointing, every spring the community is under water. It results in what I would call an intolerable sanitary condition.

Senator STENNIS. You know, they have spent a good deal of money there themselves. Do you have those figures?

General FERINGA. I do not have the figures on the amount they have spent themselves. But I have been through the town. It is a small, prosperous city, and their colored school is a modern, up-to-date school.

Senator STENNIS. I happen to know that they have spent around $750,000 themselves in connection with trying to control that water.

CUT-OFF OF RIVER

Now, you have made one cut-off, have you not?

General FERINGA. This project was started in 1940. A cut-off was made across this tortuous bend of the river, speeding the water in the Yazoo away from this general area. But that cut-off was made only to this point so that the Yazoo River now flows along this black line and then along the blue line. The entire project contemplates continuing this cut-off on this bend also and bringing the Yazoo water in well below the city.

Senator CORDON. I take it that what you have done up to now does not help at all.

General FERINGA. It does some good.

Senator CORDON. It gives the water a little more opportunity to get there more rapidly.

General FERINGA. It does some good, but the project is not completed.

This project was begun in 1940, and shortly after beginning it, the war came along.

Senator CORDON. How would you say the project, as already carried out, benefits Yazoo City; that is, that cut-off?

General FERINGA. Well, all right, sir; I agree with you.

Senator CORDON. All right.

General FERINGA. But the project was begun in 1940, and the war came along.

The entire project calls for this cut-off to be completed with levees to be put in here. Then this water will be taken away from these people.

Senator STENNIS. And this will be one case where there will be a complete and absolute remedy?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir; they will never get wet there again.

Senator STENNIS. And this is the same project for which we appropriated funds in 1951?

General FERINGA. That is correct.

Senator STENNIS. But the money was cut back under the Executive order?

General FERINGA. What happened on that, as you will recall, is that the bill went to conference and stayed in conference. The conferees agreed that $5 million should be cut off except, I think, for those projects—and I am talking from hazy memory—which were pertinent to the war effort.

Senator STENNIS. Yes, that is right.

General FERINGA. Therefore, I think the budget took this item off. They did what they were told to do by the conferees.

Senator STENNIS. If I may refresh your memory and the memories of the members of the committee, while this appropriations bill was in conference, the Korean war started and this cut was applied in conformity with the Executive order.

Now, do you consider this an urgent project?

General FERINGA. Without question, sir.

Senator STENNIS. In remedying a situation that is acute?

General FERINGA. This is my fourth spring on this work, and this is the fourth time that I have seen these people exposed to this intolerable situation. Again I say that these are not wealthy people, and I do not mean any discredit to them by saying that.

Senator STENNIS. These people who are injured are really hurt when the water hits them every year.

Senator CORDON. How high does the water get in the area that is built up?

General FERINGA. It usually comes to the level of the floors. In some places it gets into the bottoms of the houses that are built down there. It does not get to the point where they could drown. It just makes an intolerable situation.

Senator STENNIS. And, under the present situation, it happens every year?

General FERINGA. May I keep some of this descriptive language off the record?

Senator STENNIS. That is all right.

(There was a statement off the record.)

YAZOO RIVER RESERVOIR

Senator STENNIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may take just 1 minute, I have not talked to the General about this, but I would like to have him mention these dams up here on tributaries of the Mississippi.

I understand that you are planning on completing Arkabutla next year.

General FERINGA. It is completed and Sardis is completed.

Senator STENNIS. Then Enid is the one that is being completed?

General FERINGA. And we are finishing that below our original estimate. However, we never have any funds left over, because if any funds are left over we apply them to the rest of the project. Grenada will be completed a year from next fall.

Senator STENNIS. These dams have been taking a large part of the funds that you have been spending in this area in order to correct the acute situations on some of those tributaries.

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir.

RESIDUAL FUNDS

Senator STENNIS. Would you say that it would be desirable to give you authority to use such residual funds as you may have to continue these authorized projects that have been deferred so long?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. However, we must use our funds in accordance with the testimony given before the congressional committees. I feel free to allocate funds to the main-line levees because we have testified about the importance of those levees to both Houses. I would not feel justified, for instance, doing work on the Sunflower project, if there were money available, without congressional instructions to that effect.

Now, it is always possible for this kind of situation to arise: It is always possible, for instance, that the steel strike might make it necessary for some work to be retarded. There might be inordinately high water. If we have the general instructions of the Appropriations Committee, if we had your blessing and if it was contained in the report or a letter were addressed to the Chief Engineer that it was your wish that should any funds become available from an unforeseen cause, such as a strike, you would like to have the funds apply—and, again, let me go to your project, Senator McClellan: to the lower St. Francis River, and to Steele's Bayou, which is needed and to the Sunflower——

STEELE'S BAYOU, MISS.

Pardon me for hopping around a bit, but Steele's Bayou was one of these natural-drainage areas which, in the 1927 flood when the Mississippi River went over its banks, filled up full of sand. Now the water cannot get out of Steele's Bayou at all. We have gotten up as far as the Rolling Fork road. I believe you know where Rolling Fork is, Senator.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

General FERINGA. Another $500,000 will bring Steele's Bayou to completion.

Senator STENNIS. Let me put it this way: Should you have residual funds that you could use, would you mind filing here for the committee a list of the projects that the funds should be applied to?

General FERINGA. I would like to give you that right now. I would like to say that another $1,500,000 should be applied to the St. Francis project; some funds should be used on Steele's Bayou, and some should be used on the Sunflower project.

Senator STENNIS. The Sunflower cut-off?

General FERINGA. Yes; at the point I am indicating, Senator.

I think some additional funds are needed very badly on the Lafourche and Boeuf project which we have not talked about.

Senator STENNIS. When you mention these projects, I take it you consider them acute and urgent; is that correct?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. I do not want to lead you. I just want to get your opinion.

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. Have I answered your question?

Senator STENNIS. That answers it.

General FERINGA. Thank you.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Then are there any other questions?

INSTRUCTIONS REQUESTED ON YAZOO CITY PROJECT

General FERINGA. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that, inasmuch as the Bureau of the Budget has eliminated those funds in our request, we must have congressional instructions, because we do what the budget tells us unless Congress tells us otherwise.

Senator STENNIS. Of course. You say that the Budget eliminated the Yazoo City project, giving the reason that they considered it a new start; is that correct?

General FERINGA. That is correct, sir.

Senator STENNIS. But do you consider it a new start?

General FERINGA. No, sir. That is their reasoning, and they lay down the ground rules.

Senator MCCLELLAN. You do not consider the St. Francis project a new start; do you?

General FERINGA. They call it a new start.

Senator MCCLELLAN. But you do not?

General FERINGA. No, sir; but they establish the ground rules, Senator.

BOEUF AND LAFOURCHE PROJECT, LOUISIANA

Senator LONG. May I have just about two questions, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MCKELLAR. Certainly.

Senator LONG. General, you mentioned the Lafourche and Boeuf project. Will you briefly explain the situation there, please? It is my understanding that the local government between the State and the parishes, which are usually described as counties, has spent a large amount of money to bring drainage into that area, but the water simply cannot get out because the Government has no money to open up the main drains out of the area.

General FERINGA. Generally speaking, it is the same type of project as is the St. Francis and the Yazoo Basin except that in Louisiana the State and the parishes combined take care of all of the lateral drainage. The State puts up one half of the money and the parish puts up the other half, and then they bring the lateral drainage down to the main channels. Now, the main channels are the responsibility of the United States through regular flood-control authorization.

Now some of these ditches, what you might call these lateral ditches, have been brought down. I am pointing to Lafourche and Boeuf. At the point where those lateral ditches join the main drainage channel, the lateral ditches are deeper than the presently existing main channel and a lake is formed.

Now, when our project is carried up to that point, the channel will be deep enough so as to accommodate the flow from the lateral drains.

Senator LONG. Meanwhile the problem is that the State's ditches are filling up waiting for the Federal Government to open up the channels which are the Federal Government's responsibility?

General FERINGA. Yes, sir. They are filling up because the water cannot get out; and when they fill up they will have to do the work over again. That is why that project is so important.

NAVIGATION THROUGH PLAQUEMINE LOCKS

Senator LONG. Then you have the Atchafalaya project where navigation is being backed up clear to Baton Rouge. I understand there is no money here for the Sorrell or Plaquemine locks.

General FERINGA. That is a Rivers and Harbors project. It comes under the Rivers and Harbors authorization. That is the route from Port Allen via Indian Village to Morgan City along the levees. The channel now goes into Plaquemine lock. Indian Village is about where I am pointing. The new project which was authorized, I think, in the 1944 act, would bring it right up here where it would terminate. That is a Rivers and Harbors project and there is no money for it.

Senator LONG. The lock at Plaquemine is becoming so antiquated that it is about to fall apart. It is completely obsolete. There are two curves in the channel that modern transportation cannot surmount in addition to a railroad bridge and a highway bridge.

The situation is such that you have to put the vessels through with a shoehorn. Modern barges avoid that lock and either go through New Orleans or try to get up the Atchafalaya River.

General FERINGA. They either have to go through New Orleans running three times as far or go up and down the Atchafalaya River which is only navigable during high water.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other questions?

If not, General, you have made a splendid presentation, and we are very much obliged to you.

I will now ask the committee to hear Mr. Fowler, of Memphis.

General FERINGA. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fowler does not need my commendation, but I would like to say that he is one of the most outstanding public servants I have ever had the pleasure of working with. I will say that whether he contradicts me or not.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM B. FOWLER, CITY ENGINEER, MEMPHIS, TENN.

MEMPHIS HARBOR SEWER PROJECT

Mr. FOWLER. My name is William B. Fowler. I am the city engineer of the city of Memphis. I have been engineer almost as long as you, Senator, have been in the Senate, although I do not think it is quite that long.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I think it is longer.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish I had as distinguished a record as you have, Senator.

Now, I do not want to repeat much of what General Feringa has had to say, except to endorse everything that he has said.

I think we in Memphis, and I think most of the people along the lower valley, are strong advocates of the Corps of Engineers. My relations with them, over a period of 33 years, have been most pleasant—and we have not always done everything they have asked us to do.

Chairman MCKELLAR. They have done a great job.

Mr. FOWLER. They have done a great job.

DELETED BY HOUSE

I want to address my remarks particularly to the diversion of Nonconnah sewer which is part of our harbor project and which has been deleted from the appropriation made by the House.

Chairman McKellar. That is located just south of Memphis, is it not?

Mr. Fowler. That is right.

I did not testify before the House, and what I am about to say, as far as I am concerned, has not been said before any congressional committee.

NONCONNAH CREEK SEWER

Nonconnah Creek, as the Senator says, is at the extreme southern portion of the city. In fact, it is the city limits of the city. This so called Nonconnah sewer was built by the Federal Government through the Federal Works Administration back in 1943. It was built for the purpose of serving three Government institutions, the veterans hospital, the quartermaster depot, and the airport which was used at that time by the Air Corps.

Chairman McKellar. And that was built by the city?

Mr. Fowler. It was built by the Federal Government using a 100 percent Federal grant at a cost of $958,000.

Senator Stennis. Do you mean the airport?

Mr. Fowler. No, Senator. The sewer was built with a 100 percent Federal grant on the application of the city.

Chairman McKellar. When was it built?

Mr. Fowler. It was built in 1943. Application was made to the Federal Works Administration. The project was approved on March 16, 1943. It was accepted by the city on March 6, 1943, and was completed in 1945.

Senator McClellan. Do you have to maintain it?

Mr. Fowler. Yes, we do have to maintain it. That is done at a cost of about $25,000 or $30,000 a year.

That is the first thing I want to say. Now, while that sewer was designed to take an additional load, the principal function of that sewer is to serve the Government installations I have mentioned. The point of discharge of the sewer into Nonconnah Creek was approved by the United States Public Health Service, the Public Health Service of the State of Tennessee, and the public health authority of the city of Memphis.

It was approved for the reason that there was sufficient flow in Nonconnah Creek at that time to dissipate and relieve any fear of pollution. This is the first point.

Now, in our application—I happen to antedate General Feringa on this harbor business. I prepared the first application made to the United States engineers for this harbor. What I have here is an exact duplicate of my application. In my application we said this:

It has also been suggested that an opening be provided under the dam that will permit a volume of 500 cubic feet per second to pass into the chute so as to keep it clean. In working out the details of this plan, consideration should be given to Nonconnah Creek which will discharge into this area and also the Nonconnah sewer which lies just south of Nonconnah Creek and which also empties into this area. It is believed that the opening under the dam so as to

provide a minimum of 500 cubic feet per second at low water will be sufficient to keep the inner harbor clear. If this is not sufficient, however, other plans for the disposition of this sewer must be made.

Now, in the recommendation of the Secretary of War to the Congress, there is set out what was asked by the local interests, and that is as follows:

A dam across the head of Tennessee chute, including revetment, bank pavement, and a conduit in the dam.

Now, when the recommendation was made by the Chief of Engineers, they said:

The plan outlined herein, generally in accord with the desires of local interests, provides for an off-river harbor with provisions for adequate terminal and industrial sites having both flood protection and correct access to water transportation. The principal features of the plan with tentative dimensions are as follows: Extension of existing sanitary sewer from its outfall near Nonconnah Creek to the Mississippi River at the lower end of Tennessee chute.

EXTENSION OF SEWER

In other words, it was our suggestion that an opening be made in the dam of sufficient size so that an adequate amount of fresh water would be provided to keep the water in the Tennessee chute clear. However, the principle of extending the sewer was adopted instead which, as General Feringa has pointed out, was less costly by far. That has proven to be good enginering because it has been estimated that if we had left an opening on the upper side of the dam, which is sort of on a curve, with a gate there, it would have been dangerous to the stability of the dam itself.

In addition, the cost of the maintenance in keeping that culvert or opening clear would have been costly and probably would have necessitated dredging every year.

As a matter of fact, we are having to dredge considerably above the dam in order to keep the piers of the Pure Oil Co. and of the Texas Co. clear for navigation.

So that was what was contemplated, and they only had two alternatives—either providing the opening in the dam or diverting the sewer. The sewer has proven to be, by the original estimates and those subsequent, the most feasible and the most practical from every point of view and certainly the least costly.

Chairman McKellar. And the most efficient, too?

Mr. Fowler. Yes, the most efficient.

CITY OF MEMPHIS ENDORSES PROJECT

Chairman McKellar. I want to ask you this general question, Mr. Fowler. Do you represent, as the city engineer, not only the city of Memphis generally, but the citizens of Memphis as well?

Mr. Fowler. Yes, sir, I think I do; because I have here the photograph handed to me by one of the local papers showing the effects of that sewer emptying into Tennessee chute. You can see the discoloration of the water, resulting from that sewer emptying into the still pool.

Chairman McKellar. That may be filed with the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. There was a big article in the Saturday Press which showed this emptying into Tennessee chute. That article mentioned the fact that I was coming up here to talk to you gentlemen.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The mayor of Memphis telephoned me that you were going to speak for the city of Memphis as well as for the people of Memphis.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, sir. I am speaking for the city of Memphis, because the mayor sent me. I also appear on behalf of Shelby County, which is the cosponsor of this thing. In addition, I appear for the harbor commission in which I happen to be the engineer. I think this is a matter of vital concern to everybody in the city of Memphis. We have launched on a project which we think is going to be of great benefit to the whole valley and not only to the city of Memphis.

Senator MCCLELLAN. If the project is not provided for, Mr. Fowler, will the condition there become aggravated to the point where some special treatment at considerable expense will have to be given to it?

Mr. FOWLER. Senator, it is almost impossible to put a treatment plant in there except at a very much larger expense than is here contemplated.

Senator MCCLELLAN. That is the point I am getting at. The situation would be dangerous to health if something is not done?

Mr. FOWLER. It would be a terrible health menace.

Now, there is one other question that I would like to clear up with you gentlemen.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The extension of Nonconnah sewer will be under pressure. It will go under the levees and from there into the river. When the river is high, there is a back pressure on that sewer. In order to have that sewer empty our sewers, we have to furnish local sewers.

The letter from the Secretary of War states—and this is also part of the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers—that it is the obligation of local interests to serve the project.

We have about 9,000 acres which will cost us about $1,500,000 to sewer. That will be entirely independent of Nonconnah sewer. No part of the Federal Government's extension of Nonconnah sewer will be of benefit to the sewer system to be developed for our island project.

Senator MCCLELLAN. In other words, local interests are providing the sewers for the island project?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, sir; we are providing the sewers for the project itself.

Senator MCCLELLAN. And this project we have under consideration here arises by reason of the construction of a Federal project and where changes will have to be made or further facilities provided for the local community?

Mr. FOWLER. That is true, Senator.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The original project was put in by the Federal Government for the purpose of furnishing sanitation.

Mr. FOWLER. It was put in to furnish sanitation for the Veterans' hospital, the quartermaster depot and the airport.

Senator STENNIS. Does this line serve only those three Federal agencies?

Mr. FOWLER. No, sir. There have been developments built around those institutions.

Senator STENNIS. But it serves only those three institutions primarily?

SALE OF LAND

Mr. FOWLER. Primarily; yes, sir.

Now, I want to say one other thing to you gentlemen. That is that we have sold a tract of ground on President's Island to the Sinclair Oil Co. with an obligation to furnish them railroad facilities, light, gas, water, drainage, and sewer facilities. We have sold them 10 acres for $50,000 or $5,000 an acre, and it is going to cost over $1 million to provide the facilities they will require. Of course, that investment of $1 million will not only serve that one installation. However, we will spend that much money in the next 5 months as we have obligated ourselves by contract to provide the Sinclair people with those facilities.

Now, up to now we have done everything that was expected of us. This project was approved only last November and the project was then turned over to us for maintenance. This is the condition of the project now. This photograph shows how much has been built up to now. There are about 300 acres over there. We have one substantial firm, the Sinclair people, who will ship out of that plant about 20 cars a day at an actual saving of about $1.60 per ton which is a substantial saving in water rates over freight rates.

SAVINGS IN TRANSPORTATION RATES

Chairman MCKELLAR. That shows the importance of the general project to the Mississippi River.

Mr. FOWLER. That is entirely true, Senator. This project, when it is completed, will effect a saving of somewhere between $3 and $5 million a year in transportation rates. That shows the value of water transportation.

One of the Senators asked about how many cars had gone in there. This picture shows the situation. There are 100 cars, I think, on there.

A concern that uses our water front down there is contracting with us now for the purchase of 20 acres so that they can use the island. They now have to unload on the river front and then they hire jockeys to take these cars down to a storage area, a place 3 miles south, where they unload them. Over on the island, they can unload and store the cars and ship them out without having these so-called jockeys, which will save them pretty close to $100,000 a year.

Gentlemen, I think there has just been a misunderstanding about this sewer proposition, and I am sorry we have gotten into the position where we have had to explain the thing.

I hope you gentlemen will feel free to ask me any questions you desire.

Senator MCCLELLAN. As I understand it, you did not appear before the House committee as you did not know this item was going to be challenged?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not. If I had known, Senator, I would have been right there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You thought it was included in the bill?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, sir, I thought it was included in the bill.

One thing which I should think should be said is that the engineers do not get enough out of an appropriation in one year to do the whole job. They let what they call a continuing contract, and then they depend on the appropriations in the subsequent years to complete the project.

I hope you gentlemen will help us get this amount restored so that we can do this job which is certainly a most important job and certainly a part of the whole project.

Senator LONG. Undoubtedly, the project, Mr. Chairman, will not be completed until this sewer-line extension is finished.

Mr. FOWLER. Actually, Senator, with another year of hot weather like we had last year, we are going to have a most difficult situation because in the north part of town, we get a southwest wind, and with this stagnant water there, we are going to have a terrible stench.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the Nonconnah Creek is a small stream, too.

Mr. FOWLER. It is practically in the summertime.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any questions by any of the members?

Senator LONG. We are certainly happy to see you develop a modern harbor in Memphis.

We hope you will not take some of our traffic away from Baton Rouge.

Mr. FOWLER. I think we are going to help you down there in Louisiana, Senator.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you, Mr. Fowler.

Now, the next question is about our next meeting.

Will the engineers be ready to go ahead tomorrow?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We will recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1 p. m., Monday, May 5, 1952, a recess was taken until 11 a. m., Tuesday, May 6, 1952.)